

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Plaintiff

V.

JOSEPH WILLIAMS, et al.,

Defendants

On September 5, 2019, Magistrate Judge Ferenbach recommended that I dismiss this case with prejudice because plaintiff Arthur Mayo failed to update his address, did not respond to court orders, failed to file a response to an order to show cause, and did not appear at a show cause hearing. ECF No. 93. Mayo did not file an objection. Thus, I am not obligated to conduct a de novo review of the report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (requiring district courts to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings to which objection is made”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (“the district judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations de novo *if objection is made*, but not otherwise” (emphasis in original)).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Ferenbach's report and recommendation (**ECF No. 93**) is **accepted** and plaintiff Arthur Mayo's amended complaint (**ECF No. 64**) is **DISMISSED with prejudice**. The clerk of court is instructed to enter judgment in favor of the defendants and against the plaintiff.

DATED this 26th day of September, 2019.

ANDREW P. GORDON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE